

U.S. Patent Appln. No. 09/800,330
Resp. Dated Nov. 7, 2005
to Office Action of July 6, 2005
Docket No. 6169-143

IBM Docket No. BOC9-1999-0090

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted responsive to the Office Action dated July 6, 2005 (Office Action). This response is filed after the 3-month shortened statutory period, and as such, a retroactive extension of time is hereby requested. The Examiner is authorized to charge the appropriate extension fee to Deposit Account 50-0951.

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-25, and 28-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2001/0042083 to Saito, *et al.* (Saito) in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0054090 to Silva, *et al.* (Silva). At page 6 of the Office Action, claims 6-7 and 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Silva, in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,102 to Khandekar (Khandekar).

Applicants hereby submit an additional declaration, signed by another one of the inventors, as instructed by the Examiner at page 10 of the Office Action, where it is also stated that the declaration previously submitted, though not signed by all the inventors, presents the necessary information to overcome the previous rejection. Applicants' are endeavoring to locate two remaining inventors and will submit the inventors' signed declarations as soon as they are obtained.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 13, 14, and 22 to emphasize certain aspects of Applicants' invention. Claim 33 has been added to further emphasize certain additional aspect of Applicants' invention. As discussed herein in the context of the newly-cited references, the amendments and newly presented claim are supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by virtue of the amendments.

U.S. Patent Appln. No. 09/800,330
Resp. Dated Nov. 7, 2005
to Office Action of July 6, 2005
Docket No. 6169-143

IBM Docket No. BOC9-1999-0090

I. Applicants Invention

It may be useful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention prior to addressing the cited references. The invention provides an apparatus and method for repurposing formatted content. According to the invention, content corresponding to a predetermined topic can be extracted from a document and reformatted for presentation in another document. (See Specification, p. 11, lines 4-7.) More particularly, the predetermined topic can correspond, for example, to the high and low temperatures in a particular city, stock quotes for selected companies, and scores of games played between members of a certain sports league. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 4, line 4 – p. 5, line 5; p. 11, line 19 – p. 12, line 10; p. 17, line 19 – p. 18, line 7; and p. 19, line 21 – p. 20, line 19.)

One embodiment of the invention, typified by independent Claim 1, is a method for converting formatted content. The method includes receiving a content request from a client specifying a network location from which a specified document including formatted content can be retrieved, the content request further indicating a target format. The method further includes identifying a template that corresponds to the specified document and target format. The identification is based on a template identifier corresponding to a network location identifier, and the template provides at least one content marker identifying within the specified document data corresponding to a predetermined topic. Additionally, the method includes retrieving the specified document at the specified network location, and applying to it the template to extract data. The method further includes formatting the data with the template to produce a second document formatted according to the target format.

II. The Claims Define Over The References

As already noted, independent Claims 1, 13, 14, and 22 were deemed unpatentable over Saito in view of Guck. Saito is directed to a system that for generating a user-defined

U.S. Patent Appln. No. 09/800,330
Resp. Dated Nov. 7, 2005
to Office Action of July 6, 2005
Docket No. 6169-143

IBM Docket No. BOC9-1999-0090

search template that extracts a predetermined set of information from "substantially similar documents." (Paragraphs 0006 and 0035; see also Abstract.). Guck is directed to a network-based system and method for converting the content of a source file -- designated an object in an object-oriented database (OODB) -- into a desired format in response to a network client request.

It is noted at page 3 of the Office Action that Saito does not disclose a template that corresponds to a markup language or the formatting of a document into a markup language. It is stated, however, that the "shadow file" disclosed in Guck serves as a template and corresponds to a specific document format that includes a markup language. As explicitly described in the reference, the shadow file in Guck does not contain content, but rather "merely 'points' back to the source file with certain 'object-connecting' techniques." (Col. 4, lines 41-54.)

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that neither Saito nor Guck teaches or suggests each of the features of the independent claims, as amended. For example, neither reference teaches or suggests using one or more templates that each has at least one content marker for extracting from document data corresponding to a predetermined topic, as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 13, 14, and 22 as well as newly-added Claim 33. It follows that the references, alone or combined, fail to provide any mechanism for extracting from document data such as weather temperatures, stock quotes, or sporting scores or the "repurposing" of the data by formatting the data for presentation in a differently-formatted document, as with Applicants' invention. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 11, lines 19-21; p. 17, lines 6-8; and p. 20, lines 4-10.)

Saito extracts a predetermined set of information from a document using a template, but Saito does not teach or suggest a template that extracts data corresponding to a predetermined topic. Instead, the template in Saito divides a document into distinct areas, one area containing text and another containing an image. (Paragraphs 0006-0009,

U.S. Patent Appln. No. 09/800,330
Resp. Dated Nov. 7, 2005
to Office Action of July 6, 2005
Docket No. 6169-143

IBM Docket No. BOC9-1999-0090

and 0037-0042.) The templates provided by Saito are directed to the "layout or spatial arrangements of elements." Each block of elements produced by the templates contains all elements in the block irrespective of the particular topic or content of the elements. Even when seeking to identify explicit terms (e.g., date, sender, and recipient) in an unknown document, Saito relies on a template based on "circumscribed rectangular sub-areas" where the terms are likely to be found, each sub-area being individually selected by a user. (See paragraphs 0037 and 0047-0049.)

It follows that the templates provided by Saito do not identify and extract from a document individual data based on a predetermined topic, as recited in each of amended independent Claims 1, 13, 14, and 22 as well as newly-added Claim 33. Instead, the templates provided by Saito identify blocks of data content within "minimally circumscribing rectangles" for dictating the layout or spatial arrangement of elements extracted from a document irrespective of any particular topic. (See paragraphs 0047-0049.) The blocks or areas of text and image generated with Saito's templates do not serve to extract data corresponding to a predetermined topic, as recited in amended independent Claims 1, 13, 14, and 22 as well as newly-added Claim 33.

Although Guck discloses templates corresponding to a specific markup language, Guck like Saito fails to teach or suggest a template that extracts data corresponding to a predetermined topic. Applicants respectfully maintain that Saito and Guck, alone and in combination, fail to teach or suggest each of the features recited in amended independent Claims 1, 13, 14, and 22 as well as newly-added Claim 33. Applicants, therefore, respectfully assert that these claims define over the prior art. Applicants also respectfully assert that whereas each of the other claims depends from one of the amended independent claims while reciting additional features, the dependent claims likewise define over the prior art.

U.S. Patent Appln. No. 09/800,330
Resp. Dated Nov. 7, 2005
to Office Action of July 6, 2005
Docket No. 6169-143

IBM Docket No. BOC9-1999-0090

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 7, 2005

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Marc A. Boillot, Registration No. 56,164
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000